

signing of the Constitution and there will be a replica of the Constitution available for Members to sign to indicate their rededication to the principles of our Government.

The president of the National Conference on Citizenship, Mr. Joseph H. Kanter, and Mr. Justice Tom Clark will be present to welcome the Members and I hope many of those present will be able to attend the reception.

ENERGY CONSERVATION AND OIL POLICY ACT OF 1975

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the first order of business when the House goes into the consideration of legislation will be H.R. 7014, as I understand it, and the first order of business in that will be my motion to strike sections 301, 302, and 303 from that legislation. This takes out of the bill the Eckhardt-Staggers price rollback provision which will of course, as has been advised before, not gain Presidential approval should it remain in the legislation. My proposal would wipe the slate clean in effect in H.R. 7014 with reference to pricing provisions by taking out the controversial pricing issue from an otherwise very controversial bill and prepare the way for rational compromise between the Congress and the President.

Rolling back prices of course is not the way to deal with the energy crisis. It is not the way to stimulate domestic production of oil and we do need realistic domestic prices to do that. We should not make an attempt to repeal the law of supply and demand. We should not play a partisan role but we should play a statesmanlike role so the American people and this Congress can work in a spirit of cooperation in the national interest on this question of oil pricing and oil production.

Pricing should be dealt with separately, perhaps in extending the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act or as a free-standing piece of legislation. There is enough controversy in the bill H.R. 7014 without the pricing provisions.

ENERGY CONSERVATION AND OIL POLICY ACT OF 1975

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Ohio, I would say the gentleman knows and I think the Nation knows that the Senate has failed to override the President's veto of S. 1849 and has, to date, failed to act on an additional House bill to extend the price and allocation controls contained in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act. We are now without any regulation of fuel in America. The OPEC countries say they are going to raise prices. America will be condemned to follow right after them.

As the president of Mobil Oil said, to deregulate right now would cause chaos in this country and cause the greatest rise in prices ever in the history of this country. He later came along and said he did not mean what he said because some pressure was put on him, but he made that statement. I believe it.

If we do not keep a pricing section in this bill, we might as well not pass the bill.

I think it is too important for the people who have to have the fuel, those who have to have heating oil and the farmers who have to use propane gas and the gas manufacturers and everybody. We must keep this pricing section in the bill.

So I would ask every Member present to vote aye on this. America is aroused on this subject.

Some do not recognize that when the pricing provisions go down, our economy will go down with them.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S 5-PERCENT ALTERNATIVE PAY PLAN

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to alert the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that at its regular business meeting tomorrow I intend to move to take up for direct consideration the resolution sponsored by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HARRIS), House Resolution 688.

This is the resolution which disapproves the President's alternative pay proposal of 5 percent. I certainly do not support the resolution. I do feel it important, however, that this resolution receive prompt consideration by the committee because of its significance to all Members of the House.

I believe if this resolution is brought to the floor, it will be soundly defeated, thereby demonstrating to the American public and the press that this body is not greedily grabbing for a pay raise, as we have been portrayed.

By defeating the Harris resolution and supporting the President's 5-percent alternative pay plan, the savings to the taxpayer would be \$1.6 billion. It will also show that this whole pay issue does not revolve around congressional pay, as the editorialists would have the public believe. The congressional tie-in to the October pay adjustment came as a result of pressures from the judicial and executive branches to relieve Federal judges and top-level executives from the salary crunch they have experienced over the past 6 years.

The alternative pay plan affects all General Schedule civilian employees, the military, the judiciary, and top executives. It, of course, also affects congressional pay, but that part of the whole package is minimal.

Therefore, I suggest we place the emphasis where it belongs, and that is support of the President in his attempt to hold down Federal spending by trimming

back from 8.66 percent to 5 percent the comparability pay adjustment for Government workers.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 8365, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1976

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8365) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976 and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McFALL, YATES, STEED, KOCH, ALEXANDER, DUNCAN of Oregon, MAHON, CONTE, EDWARDS of Alabama, and CEDERBERG.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 8121, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1976

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8121) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SLACK, SMITH of Iowa, FLYNT, and ALEXANDER, Mrs. BURKE of California, and Messrs. EARLY, MAHON, CEDERBERG, ANDREWS of North Dakota, and MILLER of Ohio.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 49, NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 49) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish on certain public lands of the United States national petroleum re-

that happier days are, if not yet here again, on their way.

I cite only two such indicators of better times—Devine of Notre Dame and Durkin of New Hampshire.

For, Mr. Speaker, last Monday night in Massachusetts, the mighty University of Notre Dame, playing its first football game under the leadership of a new head coach, Dan Devine, following the legendary Ara Parseghian, vanquished—if the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, will forgive my saying so—Boston College.

But, Mr. Speaker, if this were not enough to gladden one's heart, the overwhelming election by the people of New Hampshire yesterday of John Durkin, the nominee of the Democratic Party, as their new U.S. Senator, should lift the spirits of everyone who has had to suffer these past dark years of a Republican administration in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, the day of Devine, Durkin, the Democrats, and Notre Dame has come.

Mr. Speaker, happy days are here again.

NEED FOR RESTORING DEATH PENALTY FOR KILLING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my tragic duty to report to the Congress that late last night two New York City policemen were brutally slain on a street in lower Manhattan.

The victims were Sgt. Frederick Reddy and Patrolman Andrew Glover. Witnesses accounts indicate that the two police officers had stopped a car with three occupants for a routine check. The three occupants of the car immediately opened fire on the two policemen mortally wounding them and they were found lying on the street. They were taken to Bellevue Hospital where they died shortly after arrival.

Thus far the killers have not been found. It is my hope that the massive search which is now underway will result in the swift apprehension of these depraved individuals.

Congress can no longer ignore what has become a critical national crisis. These two murders, the scores which have preceded them this year, as well as the scores which will likely follow them point up the urgent need for passage of legislation I have introduced to restore the death penalty on a mandatory basis for the killing of any law enforcement personnel. We must demonstrate to the policemen of this Nation that their safety is our concern by making passage of this legislation a priority legislative item.

AN ALLEGED BREACH OF SECURITY

(Mr. PIKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following letter to the President of the United States.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 17, 1975.

The President,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that because of an alleged breach of security you would like me to provide you with all secret documents in my possession pertaining to the House's investigation of the intelligence community. I have only one such document. It is in the form of a red-covered notebook containing three pages stamped "Secret Sensitive"—two letters dated July 28, 1975, from Mr. William E. Colby to me, one letter dated July 28, 1975, from me to Mr. Colby in response to those letters, and some newspaper clippings which do not appear to be classified. It is transmitted herewith.

I, frankly, am glad to get rid of it for it does in my judgment, represent a grave breach of security, and I am delighted to be able to present it to you and make a clean breast of the whole sorry affair.

This red folder containing this highly sensitive material, was lost on or about July 29, 1975, by a staff member working on the investigation. It was left in a public place. Happily, it was found by a good and loyal American who brought it to me. The contents have, I fear, been read.

It is my personal feeling that the staff member who lost it—having shown such carelessness and indifference to our national security—should be summarily dismissed, but it is not within my power to fire him. He is on your staff, not mine. While I detest informers, the gravity of the situation and the seriousness of the offense compel me to give you a hint with which I suspect the F.B.I. will be able to track him down. He is the husband of a member of your Cabinet.

With best personal regards,
Cordially,

OTIS G. PIKE.

P.S.—If he loses it again, it's O.K., I have a copy.

AN ALLEGED BREACH OF SECURITY

(Mr. McCLODY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say quite frankly that the recent highly sensitive material which ended up in the hands of the distinguished chairman of our select committee could not have reached safer hands insofar as assuring our national security. I am sure that the information will be very carefully protected, even though the gentleman now chooses to return it to the President.

I would like to say further that I understand that some disagreement has occurred between members of the committee and the executive department with respect to the publicizing or release for publication of certain classified material which our committee has requested and which has been received. I am very hopeful that we can adopt a policy in our committee which will induce the executive branch to give our committee the full cooperation which we require in order to do the kind of responsible job which we were charged by this House to do. I intend to work with the chairman toward that end and to assure that these inadvertent misplacements of secured materials which in this instance ultimately ended up in such secure hands, will not occur in the future.

S. 622 DOES INCLUDE A PRICING SECTION

(Mr. ECKHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I address the House in order to confess a mistake on my part and to apologize for leading certain other Members into error. I stated that the Senate bill S. 622 on energy contained no pricing section. Indeed it does contain a pricing section, in fact more limited than H.R. 7014, and the conclusions that I drew in my letter are, nevertheless, correct that, if we had no pricing section in H.R. 7014, our scope for conference would be too narrow to operate within such a way as to formulate a good and effective energy program.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

(Mr. FOUNTAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce that on Thursday, September 25, the Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations will begin public hearings on the State and local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972—commonly known as the General Revenue Sharing Act—and on H.R. 6558 and other bills to extend and amend that legislation. The present act expires on December 31, 1976, and the President has proposed extending the program, with minor changes, for an additional 5½ years at a cost of \$39.85 billion.

Treasury Secretary William E. Simon and other administration officials will testify on September 25 as the initial witnesses.

The subcommittee has set aside September 30 and October 1 as hearing days on this subject for Members of Congress. Members wishing to testify on general revenue sharing are invited to contact the subcommittee office—B-372 Rayburn Office Building; extension 5-2548—as soon as possible. The subcommittee will arrange for the appearance of those Members who have already requested an opportunity to testify.

Members are asked to send 25 copies of their prepared statements to the subcommittee at least 24 hours before their scheduled appearances. Written statements for the record, submitted in lieu of oral testimony, will be accepted at any time until November 1, 1975.

COMMEMORATION OF CITIZENSHIP DAY

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my distinguished colleague, Chairman ROXNO, of the Judiciary Committee, in urging my colleagues to attend the commemoration of Citizenship Day to be held at 4:30 today in the Gold Room of the Rayburn Building.

Today marks the anniversary of the